1: Roth--123-124 (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 583, 595, 586

"'It was rarely the custom amongst them to select wives from [124] their own tribes, but rather to take them furtively, or by open force, from neighbouring clans; they were monogamous, but the practice of divorce was recognized, and acted upon, on incompatibility of disposition and habits, as well as on grosser cause given. Tasmanian lords had no difficulty, and made no scruple, about a succession of wives, and would thus occasionally, after temporary separation, readjust differences, and live happily ever after with their first loves: still they never kept more than one wife at one time' (Milligan, Beacon, p. 29)."

1: Roth--124 (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 584, 595

"Calder also speaks as though they were a monogamous people: 'It is nowhere stated... that polygamy was practised by the Tasmanian; but as the man Joe... had two wives at the same time, it cannot be said the practice was unknown to them' (Journ. p. 22). Péron mentions meeting with a family of aborigines, 'two members of which, a young man and a young woman, appeared to us to be at the same time epoux et frères' (ch. xii. p. 226). There is, however, plenty of evidence to show that the natives were polygamous. West says (II. p. 78): 'Polygamy was tolerated; women were, latterly, bigamists.... It is said they courted with flowers.' Lloyd settles the question in favour of polygamy thus (pp. 44-45): 'Plurality of wives was the universal law among them. Amongst the Oyster Bay tribe, in 1821, I scarcely ever knew an instance of a native having but one gin. On the contrary, two or three were the usual allowance. I have known a grey-headed old savage to possess three wives of the respective ages of thirty, seventeen, and ten years, all betrothed to him from childhood, and from the time of their betrothal, became members of his family circle, entirely dependent on him for support.'"

1: Roth--124 [2] (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 595, 562

"In spite of Lloyd's experience, there were doubtless exceptional cases when monogamy prevailed, for on one occasion during an interview La Billardière reports: 'Two of the stoutest of the party were sitting in the midst of their children, and each had two women by his side. They informed us by signs that these were their wives, and gave us a fresh proof that polygamy is established among them. The other woman, who had only one husband, was equally careful to let us know it. It would be difficult to say which are the happiest; as the most laborious of their domestic occupations devolve upon them, the former had the advantage of a partner in them, which perhaps might sufficiently compensate their having only a share in their husband's affections' (II. ch. x. p. 60). Dove considers that from the very fact of polygamy prevailing, the condition of the women must be abject (I. p. 252)."